

## REMARKS

Applicants affirm the election of Group III, claims 9-11. Claims 1-8 and 12 are cancelled as being non-elected claims subject to a restriction requirement.

Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the claims in a divisional application.

Claim 10 is amended to depend from claim 9. The Examiner's treatment of claims 10 and 11 in the Office Action as being dependent from claim 9 is greatly acknowledged.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-10 under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noro. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noro et al. in view of Holyroyd. In view of the following comments, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the claims as presented herein is requested.

The reference to Noro discloses a single MFT driven by the output of a MIDI synthesizer. Noro fails to identify the problem of driving multiple transducers, let alone recognizing the destructive interference that occurs or the solution of generating one or more drive signals for the transducers that prevents destructive interference. Accordingly, Noro fails to suggest Applicants' invention, and does not render the claimed invention unpatentable.

The secondary reference to Holyroyd fails to show or suggest the basic structure of applicants' invention, nor does the reference suggest providing a transducer with a crest factor of less than 0.5 dB. The Examiner's hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention is not fairly suggested by the prior art, and therefore the combination of references fails to render the claimed invention unpatentable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted

Cranfill, David B. et al.

BY:/Randall S. Vaas/ 6/26/2006

Randall S. Vaas          Date

Registration No. 34,479

Phone (847) 523-2327

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350